

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

“And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up A KINGDOM which shall never perish, and A DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever.”—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. Mott Haven, Westchester, N.Y., JULY, 1858
Volume 8—No. 7.

Mosaic and Nazarene Teaching Concerning God.

NO. 5.

WE think that by this time our readers will have comprehended the Mosaic teaching concerning God, which is the basis of the revelation which the Eternal Spirit hath given of himself in the subsequent communications made to Israel through the prophets, Jesus, and the Apostles. We have seen, that Moses did not teach three persons, three essences, or three any things, in One Godhead. By Godhead is meant the source, spring, or fountain of deity—the Divine Nature in its original pre-existence before every created thing. He teaches that this Godhead was a Unit—a Homogeneous Unit, undivided into thirds, or fractions.

At this point of the inquiry, the true believer meets the Jew face to face in the approving presence of Moses and Jesus. They all agree on this point, and say in the words of the Sh'ma, “There is One Jehovah.” Compare Deut. vi. 3, with Mark xii. 29—32. By doing so the reader will see that Jesus was as emphatic and precise in his teaching concerning God as Moses; and that those who heard him teach understood him in the Mosaic sense; for a Scribe (and all the Scribes were students of the law, and zealous for their interpretations of Moses) said to him: “Well, Teacher, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but He:” upon which Jesus remarked, “Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God.”

But here the agreement ceases at the threshold; for not content with one Eternal Spirit named Jehovah, the rejecter of Jesus contends for only one eloahh. But Moses nowhere teaches that there is but one eloahh; nor does he use the phrase One Elohim—a singular numeral with a plural noun. On the contrary he teaches the existence of a plurality of Elohim. The Sh'ma does not say “Jehovah our Eloahh is one Jehovah, or one Eloahh;” but “Jehovah our Elohim is one Jehovah.” Moses and Jesus are agreed in this also; for if either of them had taught that there was but one eloahh, they would have been in opposition, or if both of them had so taught, they would have left no room for a Messiah who should be called Jehovah-Tsidkainu, as in Jer. xxiii. 6; xxxiii. 16—I shall be our righteousness: and Elohai kol-hartz, “Elohim (plural) of the whole earth,” as in Isaiah liv. 5. To have taught the doctrine of only one Eloahh, as well as only one Jehovah, would have been to set aside the doctrine of a Messiah altogether, so that there would be neither a personal Christ, nor a multitudinous Christ, the latter being constituted of all in him, the personal.

Well, then, Moses and Jesus both taught a plurality of Eloahhs. Jesus said I am Eloahh, and my Father is Eloahh, and the children of God by resurrection, each one is Eloahh; and all together we are thy Elohim, O Israel, and yet but one Jehovah. But the Jews repudiate such a God-Name as this. It is incomprehensible to them; and in their opinion, nothing short of blasphemy. It was so repugnant to their notions of things that when Jesus taught it "they took up stones to stone him;" and declared that they did so, because that he, being a man made himself Eloahh in saying, I am the Son of Ail—Jno. x. 33-36. Like Dr. de Lara, they objected to the idea of Jehovah having a son; and of that son being a man; and that man consequently Eloahh or God. Hence, when Jesus asked them "What think ye of the Christ? Whose son is he?" They did not answer, "He is the son of God;" to have done so would have been to admit that he would be equal with God, which they considered blasphemy. They therefore adhered to the fleshly view of the matter, and replied, "He is the son of David." This was equivalent to saying that he was equal with David only; and consequently, not equal with God. But this position was pregnable, and easily turned. Jesus saw their weakness, and immediately exposed it by inquiring, "How then doth David in spirit call him Adon, (lord, superior, ruler, &c.) saying, Jehovah said unto my Adon, sit thou at my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Adon, how is he his son?" They could not answer this; "no man," says Matthew, " was able to answer him a word"—ch. xxiii. 41.

The point in this argument is a question of equality; and therefore of Deity, or mere humanity. If Messiah were to have been simply son of David, then he would be equal in natural descent, and inferior in rank. If equal in natural descent he would have been no more than a son of Jesse; and if simply David's son, he would have been socially inferior, inasmuch as in society, and especially in Hebrew society, fathers take precedence of sons. This being admitted as contained in their premise upon what known principle could David speak of such a Messiah as his Adon or Sovereign Lord? Here is a notably weak point in the Jewish understanding of the doctrine concerning the Messiah. As in the days of their fathers, so to the present time, "they judge after the flesh." They can only see in Christ a son of David, having no higher origin than blood, or the impulse of the flesh, or the will of man. They have no conception of a Christ, who should be formed by the Eternal Spirit from the substance descended from David, as Adam was formed by the same Spirit from the dust; and therefore generated by the will and power of Ail, still less did they see, that such a son of Power should become a son by a spirit-generation from among the dead. The Jewish mind cannot penetrate "the veil of the covering;" so that all its reasonings begin and end in flesh, "which profits nothing." It is not to be wondered at, then, that the Jews, as Dr. de Lara says, "reject with scorn and ridicule the idea of God having a son; of coming down from heaven and enacting with the Virgin Mary the scene related by Luke." Their minds are so sensual and earthly that they cannot ascend to the contemplation of "heavenly things." What they know naturally, as brute beasts, of these things they can speak; but higher than flesh they cannot rise until the Lord shall come and take away the veil.

But, as we are taught in the Old and New Scriptures that a remnant of Israel shall be saved, we would, in the hope of our writings meeting the eyes of one or more of that remnant, reason with them concerning the Christ. We would invite them again to the question Jesus put to their fathers, saying, "What think ye of the Christ? Whose son is he?"

But no one, Jew or Gentile, can give a reasonable answer to this question who is ignorant of Moses and the prophets. And the reason of this will be obvious to every intelligent person from the consideration of the facts that "Christ," as the subject-matter of a system of knowledge, is peculiar to their writings. Moses' writings may be said to have started the

subject. It is true that the Christ-idea was in the world before Moses lived. Adam and Eve received the first promise of his appearing in listening to the sentence upon the Serpent in Gen. iii. 15. Enoch, the seventh from Adam, predicted his coming with his ten thousand saints; and Abraham saw his day, and was glad. Still the convictions and hopes of these ancients would have been lost but for Moses, who was caused by Jehovah to put them on record, and to commit the writings to the custody of the Hebrew nation. It is, therefore, exact enough to say, that, as far as we are concerned, the Christ-idea and the Christ doctrine, originated with Moses. He treats of it at large in his five books. After him the Christ-idea was dramatized, not related, but represented, by Joshua at the head of Jehovah's hosts in the conquest of the Holy Land from the Gentiles. It was also dramatized in the history of David and Solomon, and the Mosaic doctrine concerning Christ, amplified by Samuel, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and all the Prophets. The idea and teaching then, concerning the Christ being a special system of inspired knowledge peculiar, exclusively peculiar, to the prophetic writings, how can a man rationally answer the question, "What is the truth concerning the Christ? Whose son is he?" in ignorance of what they testify? It is impossible. We must study Moses and the Prophets, or we can know nothing as we ought to know it concerning the "Wonderful One" through whom the knowledge of the ETERNAL SPIRIT NAME, or God, is revealed. It is impossible to know God apart from the Christ-doctrine of Moses and the prophets; for the knowledge of Christ is the knowledge of God-manifestation to man. Let us put it in another form thus: blot out from the oracles of God the instruction concerning Messiah, and there would remain no revelation of God behind. The Christ-doctrine is the key to the Sh'ma; to the Memorial-Name for a generation of the race; to "the glorious and Fearful Name," and to all the remarkable combinations of words, grouped together without regard to grammatical rules, and so thickly distributed upon the sacred page. Let us, then, hear Moses and the prophets: "for they wrote of me" says Jesus; and if ye believe not his writings, how can ye believe my words?" Jesus had no hope of a man, in a scriptural sense, believing his doctrine, who did not believe Moses, and if he and Moses were not credited, the ignorance of the unbeliever alienated him from the life and blessedness of God; for, he says, "this is Aion-life, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent."

The first idea, then, that Moses gives us of the Christ is, that

1. He was to be born of Adam's race;
2. He was to be the Seed of the Woman and Son of God;
3. He was to be killed,
4. He was to rise from the dead; and
5. He was to destroy the power that killed him.

All this is expressed or implied in Gen. iii. 15. It teaches us by implication, that he was not to be begotten of the impulse of the flesh, nor of the will of man; so that in being born of the human nature, he would be directly Son of Woman; and only indirectly Son of Man. But, if he were not directly Son of Man, he must have been directly Son of Power as Adam was, who had no human father. Adam's father was the Eternal Spirit, self-named Jehovah, who formed him from the dust. Eve seems to have understood that the Seed of the Woman was to be some how related to the Spirit, afterwards named Jehovah, for when, in her inexperience, Cain, her first born son, came into the world, she said, "I have gotten (a play upon his name Cain) a man eth-y'howah." In the English version the text reads, "I have gotten a man from the Lord." But "from" is not in the Hebrew. There it reads, ish eth-y'howah, a man the Jehovah. But, was Eve acquainted with "Jehovah" as the name of the Spirit? Abraham was

not. If she were not, the words would seem to imply that she regarded Cain as the promised acquisition: or she may have considered that she acquired him of the Spirit, whom Moses in the record styles eth-y'howah, in which case ish would be in construction, and signify man of. If she said a man of the Spirit, then she regarded Cain as begotten of the Spirit; but if she said, a man the Spirit, in both cases Moses substituting Jehovah for Spirit, she regarded him as the Seed of the Woman promised; and still from the Spirit, rather than from Adam. Be this as it may, the event proved that he was neither "of the Spirit," or a Spirit-man; but of the flesh in the rebelliousness thereof, and therefore earthly, sensual, and demoniac.

Abraham seems to have been taught representatively, that the Son of the Woman was to be in his origin a Son of Power, that is, of God, and not of the will of man; he was taught this representatively by the case of Isaac. Isaac was as much a Son of Power, as Adam, and Jesus, in relation to flesh. Had there been no preternatural interposition of Spirit-power there would have been no Adam, Isaac, nor Jesus. Now Isaac was a type of Christ; for Moses writes that Ail-Shaddai said to Abraham, "in Isaac shall be chosen for thee a seed." Isaac in his generation, or a circumstance of his begettal; and in his figurative sacrifice and resurrection, was the representative of the Christ to his father Abraham; by which he was taught

1. That Christ the Son of Woman, was to be of preternatural paternity; and therefore, Son of Power, or God; and to descend from Isaac;
2. That He was to be killed as a sacrifice; and
3. That He was to be raised from the dead.

These things were expressed, and implied in the representation; so that, had the question been put to Abraham, "What thinkest thou of the Christ? Whose Son is he?" He would doubtless have replied, "He shall be Son of God."

But this, perhaps, may be objected to as only inferred, and not positively declared—that Moses does not say in so many words, that the Seed of the Woman was to be Son of God. But it may be replied, that the doctrine of Sonship to God is a peculiarity of the Christianity taught by Moses. What is the idea of ish eth-y'howah, but that of a Son of God, whether we read it, "a man the Jehovah," "a man of Jehovah," "a man of the Spirit," or "a man the Spirit?" It is a man of preternatural paternity in the estimation of the speaker. The Jews regarded Adam as the Son of God, and the idea came to them from Moses, who gives him the paternity. See Luke iii.28.

It is truly absurd for Jews to talk of "shrinking back and standing sternly aloof, the moment they are told that God has a Son!" Were Moses in their midst he would certainly be ashamed of them. If they will not hear Jesus, do they not hear Moses deliver God's message to Pharaoh, and say, "Thus saith Jehovah, Israel is my Son, my first-born. And I say unto thee, Let my Son go that he may serve me; and if thou refuse to let him go, behold I will slay thy son, thy first-born." Upon what principle was the Hebrew nation Jehovah's Son? Upon precisely the same principle that the Son of Mary claimed to be Son of God—upon that of Spirit-paternity. Isaac was the father of the nation, and his begettal was miraculous. The nation descended from him was a "miraculous conception"; and Jews consider those who believe that God has a Son, and in the miraculous conception of that Son, "should be set down as demented, and only entitled to pity, and to a cell in an asylum." All that the Jews say against the narrative of Matthew and Luke concerning the birth of Jesus, might be turned with equal force against Moses' account of the birth of Isaac. Matthew says, that "Mary was found with child of the Holy Spirit;" and Moses clearly shows that if the Holy Spirit had not affected

Sarah, there would have been no Isaac, and consequently no Hebrew nation. The peculiarity of Isaac's paternity is the ground of Jehovah's claim upon Israel as his son. "When Israel was a child, I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." These are the words of Jehovah by Hosea; and though spoken of a multitude, in that multitude is included the Messiah; who federally speaking, was in the loins of Nahshon at the Exodus; and personally, came out of Egypt at Herod's death.

The idea, then, of God having a son is Mosaic, and not of Nazarene origin. But we are not left to inference and implication in relation to the Christ being Son of God. That he should be both Son of Man and Son of God—"of man," by his mother, and "of God," by his Father,—is expressly stated in 2 Sam. vii. 14; 1 Chron. xvii. 13. In the Berith Olahm, or Covenant of the Aion, recorded there, Jehovah informed David, that he should have a Seed or Descendant, who should be resurrected to sit upon the throne of the House of Israel; and that the Jehovah would be his Father, and he, the Seed, should be his Son. Hence, David expected that the Son of the Woman who is to bruise the Serpent's Head, would descend from himself, and therefore be Son of Man; but that he would be begotten in one of his female descendants by the Spirit of Jehovah, and therefore be Son of God. This was the kind of Christ expected by David; and therefore in Psalm, cx. he styles Him "Lord" although his son.

The Berith or covenant, that promised this, was ever present to the mind of David. The truth of this is apparent abundantly in the Psalms; besides that, he would constantly have before his mind, what he tells us was "all his salvation, and all his delight." He understood that the subject of this covenant was the Second Adam; for when it was delivered to him, he exclaimed, "Who am I, Jehovah Elohim; and what is my house, that thou hast brought me thus far? And yet this was a small thing in thine eyes, Elohim; for thou hast spoken concerning the house of thy servant to a far distant time; and thou hast regarded me according to the oracle of the ascending Adam, Jehovah Elohim. And in 2 Sam. vii. 10, he says of the covenant, "This is the oracle of the Adam, Jehovah Elohim."

David's mind then, was full of this remarkable idea, that the Son of God was to descend from his loins. No Jew can refute this proposition. They are as dumb in its presence as when Jesus silenced their fathers, that they could not answer him a word. To the carnal mind the idea is no doubt absurd and incomprehensible, because it judges according to the flesh. How could the Son of God be born of a woman? This is "a great mystery," says Paul, "God manifested in flesh;" and with all the love of mystery, and acuteness of the human mind, Jews nor Gentiles can make nothing of it apart from Moses and the prophets.

Now look at a few sentences from David's pen as illustrative of his views of things in connexion with the Son of God, who was to descend from him. "The truth to David Jehovah swore; he will not turn from it; saying; From the fruit of thy body I will set for thee on the throne. If thy sons will keep my covenant (berith) and my testimony which I will teach them; even their sons shall sit on the throne for thee until AD adai-ad. Because Jehovah has chosen (to be) in Zion; he has desired it for a dwelling for him. This, saith he, is my rest until AD; here will I dwell, for I have desired it. There I will make a Horn to bud forth for David. His enemies will I clothe with shame; and upon Him shall his crown flourish."

1. From this we learn, that the Davidian Son of God is to be a King upon a throne in Zion, where David's sons have already reigned.
2. That the throne on which they sat is to have existence until AD;

3. That it should continue from David's time until AD, on condition of his sons keeping the covenant and the testimony.

4. That the Son of God Jehovah would consequently be the Ascending Adam Jehovah Elohim, whom in Psalm ex, David in Spirit sees at the right hand of power.

We may remark here that ad is a remoter period than olahm. Ad does not arrive till olahm has passed away. It is an indefinite series of ages beyond the thousand years of Messiah's Aion. David's throne is for this, styled in Daniel "a Season and a Time." Olahm ends where Ad begins; so that "until Ad" is to the end of Olahm. Paul refers to this when he says in 1 Cor. xv. 24. "Then cometh the END when he, Christ, shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God even the Father * * * that God may be the all things in all men"—τα πάντα εν πασι. This is what obtains beyond olahm, or in ad. When the end of Olahm touches the beginning of Ad, a change in mundane affairs again ensues. It is the epoch of the crushing of the Serpent's head, which occurs 1000 years after his being bound. The Son of God reigns until he (the Eternal Spirit) hath put all enemies under his feet." This is Paul's testimony; and that "until" is the "until Ad" of Psal. cxxxii. 12,14. When "all enemies" are destroyed, there will be no occasion for any more reigning, for to continue a reign after the last enemy is destroyed, and God is "all things in all," would be for God to reign over himself, which is absurd.

Now David's throne would have continued from David's time until Ad without interruption, if his sons had kept Jehovah's covenant and testimony; even that testimony which should be delivered to them after David wrote—"which," says he, "I shall teach them." This testimony was the Gospel of the Kingdom, which the Eternal Spirit had sent Jesus of Nazareth to proclaim to Israel—the Spirit's words put into the mouth of the prophet like unto Moses, which a man can reject only at the hazard of damnation—Deut. xviii. 15-19. But they despised the Covenant of Promise, and therefore the sons of David were excluded from the throne at the Babylonish captivity; and the throne itself abolished until the Son of God should come as "The Repairer of the breach. The Restorer of the paths to dwell in."—Isai. lviii. 12.

But David saw that the Son of God would not be allowed by the Kings of the earth and their partizans to enter peaceably upon the possession of his throne; in fact that they would do their best to prevent it. In his last words he styles them "a thorn-bush to be thrust away, and consumed;" and though they should fill the Son of God with iron and the shaft of a spear, he should nevertheless smite them and by the power of the Eternal Spirit be established in Zion as King over the nations to the utmost bounds of the earth, as testified in the second psalm. Will a Jew read this, and persist in denying that Jehovah has a Son? In that testimony he will find predicted a conspiracy to murder "Jehovah's Anointed," and so get quit of his yoke. But that it is only temporarily successful, because of the interposition of Divine Power. Jehovah laughs their impotence to scorn, and tells them that notwithstanding all efforts against it, he will set his King on Zion, after he has raised him from the dead, according to the words, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee; and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them to pieces as a potter's vessel."

In two places David refers to the Mother of the Son of God. In his last words, he tells us "that Jehovah's Spirit spoke by him, and that his word was upon his tongue." He spoke then, by inspiration. The Spirit, then, afterwards incarnate in the Son of God, says in Ps. cxvi. 16, "Jehovah, truly I am thy servant; I am thy Servant, the Son of thine Handmaid; thou hast loosed my bonds" This deliverance is in answer to his prayer in Psal. lxxxvi. 16, "O turn unto

me, and have mercy on me; give thy strength unto thy servant, and save the Son of thine Handmaid. Show me a token for good; that they which hate me may see, and be ashamed; because thou Jehovah, hast helped me, and comforted me." The person here styled Jehovah's Handmaid is the woman of Gen. iii. 15, and as Christians believe, the mother of Jesus, whom Elizabeth her cousin styled, "the Mother of our Lord;" and Gabriel, "the highly favored of the Lord," whose handmaiden she averred herself to be. "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee," said Gabriel, "and the power of the Highest One shall overshadow thee; therefore also the Holy One that shall be born of thee shall be called THE SON OF GOD. Creative power was to be preternaturally exerted as in the formation of the first Adam and of Isaac; and therefore the product was the Son of Power, that is of God.

We see, then, from Moses and David, that Christ was the Son of Woman and the Son of Jehovah; will the Jews, who object to Jesus on the ground of what they call his illegitimacy, which if proved, would make him unholy or unclean, show us how such a Christ could be born upon any other principle than that narrated by Luke. But we must conclude for this time with the remark for further elucidation hereafter, that that which is born of God is God, as Jesus has declared. —EDITOR.

The Gospel of the Kingdom not One Idea, but the Manifold Wisdom of God.

IN our number for June we were considering the difference between a professor being "weak in faith" and "weak in the faith;" a distinction which, we trust, will be duly appreciated by the reader. In our present issue we shall proceed to show still further that other strings of the Expositor's fiddle are very far from being screwed up to concert pitch; so that it is impossible to perform with him the overtures of Zion's orchestra without bringing the whole choir into disrepute. One of his fiddle-strings is perfectly rotten, and will not bear to be screwed up; yet that is the very string he prizes most of all. We say, "screw it up to the right pitch—to the right degree." "No," says he, "it is catgut—it is the right kind of string; and therefore ought to give out the right sound." But we are sceptical of its being catgut at all; we rather think it is only cotton twist; but if really catgut, "perfect in kind," we must have it "perfect in degree" of tension also, or no music will result, however skilfully Apollo may work the bow.

The constitutional defect, then, of this fiddle-string, which creates so much discord, must next be considered. We shall, therefore, drop the figurative, and proceed at once to the business in hand, by affirming that—

The Faith of the Hebrews was Perfect in Degree.

Our friend next refers to Heb. v. 12-14. Here the persons addressed had once been enlightened. "Call to remembrance," says Paul to them, "the former days, in which, after ye were enlightened, ye endured a great fight of afflictions"—ch. x. 32. Their eyes had been opened, and so wide were they awake to the truth, that "they fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before them; which hope they had as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil"—ch. vi. 18,19. Here was a hope planted in their souls which established an intelligent relationship between them in the present state, and that which is to obtain, when the future state is substituted for the present. The confession of the devils takes no note of this hope. Diabolonians have no conception of the hope of the calling. Paul says elsewhere that "we are saved by the Hope" and that there is only "One Hope." Can a man be saved by a hope of which he is ignorant, friend Marsh? Paul teaches here, that we

are the subject of a present salvation, by laying hold of the hope. He emphasizes upon it, and forces our minds upon the future, in saying, "hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." We are saved, then, by believing what we wait for. Will our friend tell us what men are taught to wait for, when they cry out with the devils, "O Jesus, we know thee, who thou art, the anointed Son of God!?" We can see no resemblance between the Hebrews and our friend's diabolonians! The former rejoiced in the hope; had full assurance of hope; and were sanctified by it, covenanted and confirmed through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once; the latter know no more about it than Mohammed, if quite so much.

But, among these Hebrew Christians there were some "who forsook the assembling of themselves together," which was an indication that they were relaxing their hold upon the hope; their hands were beginning to droop and their knees to give way; and Paul was fearful lest they would sell their birthright for a mess of pottage. They had become so weak, that they needed to be treated as babes; though they had known the truth long enough to be teachers of others; skilful instructors in the righteousness of God. This was their case. They were not unchristianized by the apostles, certainly; but they were hypothetically reduced to the dwarfishness of babes. Nevertheless, a babe in Christ is a giant compared with him who can only cry out with the devils. "Little children" says John, "I write unto you, because your sins are forgiven you on account of his name." But diabolonians are not babes. This is the point at issue. Our friend has to prove, that he who is immersed, crying out with the devils, is born into the family of God when he emerges from the water. We deny it. Divine babes are not generated so. They are begotten of the incorruptible seed, the word of the kingdom; and in consequence of such begetting, they go into the water, that they may be born babes of God, the spiritual seed of Abraham, and heirs of the promises covenanted to him. These babes are fed on the unadulterated milk of the word, that they may grow thereby. They do not take draughts, large and deep, of the cup in the hands of Jezebel, by which they are made to reel to and fro, in all the intoxication, and fornication, and spueing, of the Laodiceans of the day. They do not become all things by turns, and nothing long; on the contrary, they lay hold of the hope, and hold it fast to the end; the horizon of their faith expanding as they grow in the knowledge of the glory of God. They do not cry out with the devils, and plunge into the water, in hope of flying beyond the skies on the down of an angel's wing, when the time comes for them to "shuffle off their mortal coil:" they do not give God the lie, in protesting to the four winds that there shall be no restoration of Israel; that David's throne and kingdom shall exist no more in Canaan; that the meek shall not inherit the earth; but that it shall be shattered into countless fragments, and dissipated into gaseous nonentity! They do not affirm these things to-day, and turn a somerset to-morrow into some new alluvium of a muddy brain. No, no; they progress steadily on in the patience of their original hope, until they grow into a perfect man, "into the measure of the stature of the fulness of the Christ."

There is no evidence of our friend's charge against the Hebrew brethren, that they were ignorant of the teaching concerning the Melchizedec priesthood of Jesus. Paul says, "he had many things to say about Melchizedec, and hard to be uttered" so as to make them intelligible to readers who were "dull of hearing." The "first principles of the oracles of God" had been planted in them, as we have seen; and as he here says, in expressing his apprehension that they would have to be taught them "again" The "foundation of change of mind from dead works, and of faith toward God; the teaching concerning baptisms," and so forth, had been wrought into them; and they had been well prepared in these when they became obedient. The foundation for repentance and faith, as we have seen, was "the hope set before them;" or what Paul also terms, "the great salvation which at the first began to be

spoken by the Lord" in Galilee; "and was confirmed to them by the apostles," or them who heard him preach. This single testimony in Heb. ii. 3, is enough to upset all our friend's speculations. Let him make a note of this, to wit,

1. The one hope of the calling was set before the Hebrews;
2. The hope was set before them in the great salvation confirmed to them by the apostles.
3. This great salvation at the first was preached by Jesus;
4. When he preached it, Matthew says, it was the glad tidings of the kingdom—ch. iv. 23;
5. In preaching, he was careful to charge the disciples to tell no man that he was the Christ—Mat. xvi. 20:

Ergo—Elder Marsh is mistaken, in supposing that his one-idea proposition was the measure of their belief before they were baptized.

Apollos and the Ephesian Twelve.

The next shoal upon which our friend drives his barque is the case of Apollos. He tries to place Apollos in the same unenviable position with himself. Now, we will say this. If Elder Marsh can prove, that the immersion of Apollos, without previous faith in Jesus, was, after the day of Pentecost, recognized by Paul, afterwards his co-laborer, as true Christian baptism, we will admit that immersion, without any faith at all, is a valid baptism!!!

Now, Luke tells us that "Apollos knew only the baptism of John;" and our friend says, he was not rebaptized. Paul says, that "John baptized the baptism of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe into him who should come after him." This is all Apollos knew of baptism, or of that "Way of God" John the Baptizer preached. Apollos was an Alexandrine, or Egyptian Jew, eloquent, and mighty in the prophetic scriptures, fervent in spirit, and a diligent teacher of what he knew. But he knew nothing about Jesus. His teaching, therefore, was all to prove that the time had come for Messiah to be manifested to Israel, and that Jews ought to repent, and be baptized, that he might acknowledge them when he appeared. John taught this until Jesus was baptized; and Apollos only knew John's teaching.

But Aquila and Priscilla, two Christians, who knew John's baptism and that of the Apostles too, heard him in the synagogue. They saw that he was just the man for the whole truth, so they invited him home with them; and "expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly," or more accurately. Yes, says our friend, "more perfectly, yet he was not required to be baptized." Now to this we say, that our friend has not a shadow of proof to justify such a conclusion; on the contrary, the context proves the opposite, as we shall see.

After Apollos had left Ephesus, Paul arrived there, and found twelve men in precisely Apollos' former condition, knowing only the baptism of John. But Paul taught them the way of God more accurately; for he showed them that the Messiah whose coming John announced, had appeared, and that Jesus was he. When these disciples of Apollos heard this, they accepted Jesus. Paul had "expounded the way of God more perfectly;" but was this exposition regarded as complete without rebaptism? The very reverse; for it is testified, that when they heard Paul's exposition "they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus;" and thus knew the accurate way of God in practice as well as in theory. Will our friend say, that it was necessary for these twelve cases, identical with that of Apollos, to be rebaptized, but not for

him? There is no respect of persons in regard "to God's way; hence, what is indispensably necessary for one is indispensable for all. In those days, precept and practice went together. Repentance and remission of sins were ordered to be announced in the Name of Jesus; and apart from that name, no man, however eloquent or mighty in the scriptures, or fervent in spirit, could obtain them. Baptism alone can unite an enlightened believer to the name. It is instituted for that purpose; and cannot be omitted, if Apollos, or any other man, would obtain the things it communicates. Peter commanded the persons of the Centurion's family "to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Upon what ground could Apollos claim exemption from obedience to the same? Upon none. We conclude, then, that Apollos in being taught the way of God more accurately was rebaptized, even as the twelve—Acts xix.

The principle of these thirteen reimmersions is very instructive in the matter at issue between our friend and the society in Rochester. The principle is this—that an immersion predicated upon an unscriptural basis is invalid, and must be repeated on the true basis to be the "One Baptism." The thirteen had been baptized on an "imperfect faith," a faith of which our friend the Expositor is the champion. The faith of Paul, and the faith of Apollos, according to his metaphysics, were the same "in kind;" that is, as we understand him, Paul and Apollos were equally sincere in their believing. But, he says, they differed "in degree;" that is, we presume, in the measure or quantity, of truth they sincerely believed. This may be admitted—the faiths of Apollos and his twelve disciples, and of Paul were the same in kind, but different in degree. But what does our friend gain by this admission? A complete logical annihilation; for the conclusion from the premises is, that because the faith of the thirteen was the same in kind with Aquila, Priscilla, and Paul's; but different from their's in measure, quantity, or degree; therefore, the deficient measure had to be filled up to the standard degree, and when so filled, they were permitted to be re-baptized. If it had been discovered, that their faith was not the same in kind, though equal in degree, doubtless, they would not have been permitted to go into the water; for the apostles and their co-laborers did not baptize the insincere, if they knew it. "False brethren" having equal faith in degree, but not in kind, "crept in unawares;" their presence among the saints was no connivance of the apostles. So with respect to inequality of degree, though equal in kind. The Ephesian Twelve had not the ordinary degree of faith. They were sincere as men could be. Paul seems to have had no doubt of that; for he asks them, if they had received the Holy Spirit since they believed? A question which implies that the questioned were supposed to have been already baptized in the name of Jesus as Lord and Christ; for Peter says, that "the Holy Spirit was given to them that obey God—Acts v. 32; which obedience in those days was expressed by being immersed into the Name of the Lord Jesus—Acts ii. 38; viii. 15,16,17; x. 48; xix. 5, 6.

But when Paul found, that they were only sincere believers of a defective measure or degree of faith, he abstained from laying his hands upon them for confirmation; for if in the premises he had done so, he would have ratified our friend's sophistry, and shut up our mouth for ever; for to have given the gifts of the Spirit to sincere believers of John's proclamation of the approaching manifestation of the King of Israel; and that, too, after Jesus had been accepted of God; would have been to supersede his claim to David's throne; and to have left their minds open and free to look for another! No; sincere faith is very well in its place; but the apostles would not accept it as an equivalent for a perfect faith in degree.

Now, because Paul would not accept perfection in kind as a substitute for perfection in degree; and because he required a faith perfect both in kind and in degree; therefore, though they were baptized, or immersed, men, he would not recognize them as Christians. This is certain, from his withholding the spiritual gifts of tongues and prophecy, until their faith had

attained the appointed degree, and they had been immersed again. If they had been Christians on the ground of being immersed believers in a coming Christ, which was the nature of the Christianity preached by John and Apollos, Paul would have imparted to them the gifts without perfecting their faith, or requiring them to be reimmersed. But they were Baptists only, and not Christians, and therefore he acted according to the record.

Our friend of the Expositor seems to have a very vague notion about perfection of faith in degree. He seems to think that faith perfect in degree must be the belief of all scriptural truth capable of being known!!! And he has got the idea into his head, that we teach that a faith of such a perfection is necessary for a subject, to qualify him for a valid baptism in being immersed! Having transmuted this crotchet into a Man of Straw, he mounts his Rosinante, and lance in rest, couches his phantom steel, dashes full tilt at the miller, but doubles himself up, horse, spear, panoply, and all against the mill! "Uninspired ignorant man," "short-sighted mortal," and "corrector of the Holy Spirit," as he categorizes our humble self, we beg leave respectfully to say to our worthy friend, that we never perpetrated so "consummate" a piece of foolishness in voice or in print. We do believe, that faith must be perfect in kind and in degree; but we do not believe that said degree is unlimited or undefined.

Abraham's Faith Perfect in Kind and Degree.

Abraham's faith was perfect in kind and perfect in degree. He is the father of those who are of faith, (Gal. iii. 7;) and therefore his faith is the pattern of the faith of those who are not bastards, but his sons. The faith of Abraham's sons and daughters is like the faith of their father, in kind and in degree. This is our position, which is both scriptural and reasonable.

In the first place, Abraham's model faith was perfect in kind, and is characterized by the testimony that he believed against all probability, judging from appearances around him, of what he believed ever coming to pass—"he hoped against hope." "He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; being fully persuaded that what he had promised, he was also able to perform. And therefore it was reckoned to him for righteousness." Here was a kind of faith, opposed in all its essential characteristics, to the diabolonian faith so pertinaciously championized by our friend. In the Diabolonian Faith there is no hoping against hope; for it presents the subject nothing to hope for in the formula, "I believe that Jesus is the anointed Son of God." The most the Babylonians profess to hope for, is that they may not go to "Jemmy Squarefoot," in the locker below, to be spificated with his fiery pitchfork; but instead, to soar off to Skyana, to shout and sing for ever there, "glory, hallelujah!" But Abraham had no such hope as this. He hoped against hope, and was fully persuaded that what God had promised he would perform. Paul styles this believing on God—*επιστενσε Αβραά τω θεω*—"Abraham believed on God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness." There is no such believing on God as this in the Babylonian formula our friend delights in. But the kind of faith that justifies is such a believing on God; for Paul tells us, that what Moses wrote about the principle upon which Abraham was justified, was for our sakes as well as his. "It was not written," says he, "for his sake alone that his belief on God was reckoned to him for righteousness; but for us also." He then adds, that we shall be justified by faith of the same kind and degree; saying, "to us also faith shall be reckoned, if we believe (*επι*) upon HIM who raised Jesus our Lord from among the dead, who was delivered up for the transgressions of us (his brethren) and raised for our justification."

"Abraham," says Paul, "was not weak in faith." Hence he was not the father of the "weak in faith" our friend is so anxious to justify, that he may, it is presumable, justify himself. He had a strong, unstaggering, faith. Not so our friend, for he has been staggering along from one notion to another for thirty years. If he compares his faith and its fruits, by which it may be known, with Abraham's, he will find, judging from the antecedents which have caused his official friend to pronounce him "an unbaptized man," that there exists no similitude in kind between the two. A weak, staggering, promise-destroying "faith" (notion rather) has been our friend's; strong, unstaggering, fully-persuaded, intelligent, self-denying, God-glorifying belief, the faith, perfect in kind, of the father of the faithful, and the Friend of God.

In the next place, Abraham's faith was perfect in degree. This degree for justification, was measured by the promises. "He was fully persuaded that WHAT God had promised he was able to perform; THEREFORE it was reckoned to him for righteousness," or justification. The measure or degree was not of large capacity. A great volume of truth was not presented to him to be believed for righteousness; nevertheless the condensed truth required, under the circumstances, a perfect kind of faith to appropriate it. Abraham had been told by God, while living in Haran, that He would make of him a Great Nation; and that in him all the nations of the earth should be blessed. This, Paul says, was the glad tidings preached to Abraham. Abraham believed it, and in consequence, left Haran and came into Canaan. When he arrived there, Jehovah added another promise, saying, "Unto thy SEED will I give this land;" who is, as Paul declares, THE CHRIST. Not long after this, that is after he and Lot had separated, still another promise was added, namely, "All the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy SEED ad-olahm, during an Olahm, AION, or Dispensation of Times. After this, he defeated the Four Kings, and had an interview with Melchizedec, King of Jerusalem, and Priest to AIL ELYON, the Highest Power, to whom he paid tithes of all the battle-spoil.

Ten years had now elapsed since his arrival in Canaan; and he had attained to the age of 85, and his wife 75: still, though he had believed the gospel of the kingdom for ten years, he was nevertheless in his sins. Though perfect in kind, his faith was not yet perfect in degree. One promise more was necessary to bring up the faith to the justifying measure, or degree. It was this. "Look now," said God to those aged and childless people—"look toward heaven, and count the stars, if thou be able to number them:" and he said unto him, "So shall thy seed be." Paul says, that this was a promise to Abraham, that he should be "the father of many nations," and "possessor of the world," and that this promise was "through the righteousness of faith;" "for" says Moses, "He believed on Jehovah; and he counted it to him for righteousness."

Here then was the degree of Abraham's faith, not an item of which is touched by our friend's Babylonianism. After reading the two previous paragraphs, can any candid man say he cannot see what gospel Abraham believed for justification? To make it more obvious, if possible, we will present it in the following way. Abraham believed,

1. That his descendants would constitute a Great Nation;
2. That all other nations of the earth would be blessed in him;
3. That all the Land of Canaan should be possessed by his Seed, the Christ;
4. That he should himself also possess that land;
5. That he should possess it with his Seed in a future day, or Dispensation;
6. That he and his should possess the world;
7. That he should then be the Patriarch of that future world of nations.

Here are seven items, that a man who had the same disposition as Abraham might satisfy himself of the truth of, in less time than it has taken to write them. A man whose intellects are sharpened by the use of them in the right direction, can discern shining forth from that sevenfold measure of faith, "Glory to God in the highest heavens, over the earth peace, and good will among men." If Abraham had fallen short of the appointed degree; had he believed all but the third; his faith would have been imperfect in kind and degree; and he would not have been justified; for to believe six, and to deny a seventh, would have been to treat the truth of God as a lie; and him that promised it as a liar, as our friend of the Expositor has done, times out of mind, in preaching what he has termed the gospel. How much of Abraham's faith as specified above did he leave undestroyed, when he was protesting, as a Millerite, against what he called contemptuously "the Carnal Judaizers?" What becomes of the Great Nation in the Olahm if God has cast Israel finally to the dogs? what becomes of the blessedness of all nations in Abraham and Christ, if at his apocalypse, they are all to be destroyed? what becomes of the promise of the land, if he to whom it is deeded, comes but to witness its dissolution in flames of fire?!!! O, what a generation is this, to talk of believing the gospel in crying out with devils, and in effect denying every particle of the truth!

Nothing that Abraham believed for justification has been abolished. It is still the Gospel of the Kingdom in its elementary form. If we deny what God has promised to Abraham, we deny the gospel, although we might cry out with the devils that we know Jesus. The faith of the children of Abraham must be perfect in degree as was his. By this we do not mean that they are required to believe no more than what is expressed in the seven items. Perfection in degree for them is the measure defined in the words, "The things concerning the Kingdom of God and of the Name of Jesus Christ." There are things in this measure or degree of faith, that Abraham was not acquainted with. His faith was nevertheless perfect in degree, according to what had been promised. But after his time additional promises were made which enlarged the measure of faith. Promises were covenanted to David; and those "who walked in the steps of that faith which Abraham had in uncircumcision," contemporary with and after David, believed these promises made to him as well as those covenanted, or typically confirmed to Abraham. Concerning the promises covenanted to him, David said, "ALL hath appointed for me a Covenant of Olahm, ordered in every thing and sure; this is truly all my salvation and all my delight, though he cause it not to spring forth"—2 Sam. xxiii. 5. This was a covenant added to the covenant confirmed to Abraham in Gen. xv. 18; which both together are termed by Paul "the Covenants of the Promise," in relation to which, he says, unenlightened Gentiles, or "Gentiles in the flesh," are foreigners or strangers. The Abrahamic Covenant was the deed for the land; and the Davidian Covenant the deed to David's House for the Kingdom and Throne to be set up in the land in the Olahm, or Economy of the Fullness of Times, referred to by Paul in Eph. i. 10.

(To be continued.)

"A Correction."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD.

Sir: In your issue of May, 1858, is an article, purporting to give an account of "a gospel crisis in Rochester, N. Y., but which, as a whole, is in fact a gross misrepresentation of the transaction which it is intended to represent. The general statement therein I leave others to correct. But as you have seen fit to bring me, personally, before your readers, in a false light, I claim the privilege of a correction of the same, in your columns. You say

"All present understood what the editor of the Expositor was driving at: few of them, however, saw any force in his remarks. One, however, was an exception to this. His compositor, who in the Expositor signs himself 'S' took the floor after the editor had finished, and said a great deal; and among his sayings is said to have stated that 'for a man to know the gospel, he must know all the Old and New Testaments—and required to be forever learning it.' He denounced all tests whatever, saying, "they were all human," &c.

The facts are that instead of my saying a "great deal" after I "took the floor," I spoke but a very short time, certainly not over ten minutes in all. Your pretended quotation of my language, I deny and repudiate. I neither used the expression—nor the sentiment, and your reporter has misinformed you. The substance of what I did say, was—That the Gospel, or good news embraced the Old and New Testaments, and "that a child of God must necessarily be continually advancing in knowledge of the Gospel"—which I emphatically asserted to be true, and do so now.

Again—I "denounced"—not "all tests whatever"—but "all human tests" of the Gospel, and contend for the right of private judgment, that every man may determine for himself, what the gospel is—subject only to the tests of Revelation itself, and not those of men. I would recommend your reporter to be a little more particular and report facts as they are, not fiction—in the future.

As to the matter of the exhortation you speak of—as being offered to the "Editor of the Expositor, and "S"—regard for the estimable brother, who is mentioned as the exhorter—forbids any further notice of the matter, which would be unpleasant to him, and of no benefit to 'busy bodies.'

In conclusion, I remark that your article, as a whole, is a mis-statement of the meeting from beginning to end; and I must express my regret that your great abilities and scriptural research, is at this late day, to be handed over to the service of sectarianism and intolerance, and that you can find nothing better to employ your talents—than in berating those who have so long stemmed the furious currents of sectarian tyranny and unlicensed cant and fanaticism.

Respectfully yours,

A. SINTZENICK.

Rochester, N. Y.,
May 5, 1858.

The Correction Reviewed.

The above, then, is Mr. Sintzenick's "correction" of "the false light" in which, he says, we have seen fit to bring him before our readers. We would beg leave to say, however, that we have seen fit to present him in no other light than that which shines upon him in the letter before us, narrating the incidents of the meeting at which he spoke, he says, for ten minutes. If he reflected a different color to that in which he appears in our columns, our informant's faculty of hearing was at fault, not our disposition. We cannot say from personal knowledge whether "as a whole, our article is a gross misrepresentation of the transaction." We are certain that our informant would not wilfully misrepresent, nor do we suppose that Mr. S. would do so either; but from the position the parties occupied, we rather think our informant is as likely to be correct as Mr. S. Still we cannot determine, not having been present.

A "good deal" might be said in ten minutes; but at the same time, very little to the purpose. In this case there would be many words, but few ideas. Mr. S. seems to desire us to know that he did not say "a great deal." Our informant does not tell us whether he uttered "a great deal" of words, or said a great deal in a little—multum in parvo—much to the point in few words. Neither does Mr. S. himself. So that in reference to this point of the "correction," we do not see that anything is corrected.

As to our "pretended quotation of Mr. S.'s language," we may offer a word. The quotation is not a "pretended quotation" in our columns. It is a real one. We did not quote that which did not exist. Fortunately we have our informant's letter before us with the quotation exactly as it is in print. We therefore, beg the worthy Mr. S. to believe that we have committed no forgery; but quoted his words exactly as reported.

But whether he said the words as quoted from our informant's letter, we cannot say. Mr. S. says he did not. "The substance," says he, "of what I did say was, that the gospel, or good news, embraced the Old and New Testaments; and that a child of God must necessarily be continually advancing knowledge of the gospel." But this looks like "out of the frying pan into the fire." The Old and New Testaments may mean, either the Abrahamic and the Mosaic; the former brought into force by the death and resurrection of Jesus as the Mediator thereof; by which the true believers are sanctified, and which is yet to be made with the two houses of Israel; and the latter, that which was dedicated at Sinai, 430 years after the former was confirmed to Abraham: these are styled Beriths, testaments or covenants: or the Old and New Testaments may mean what are popularly styled "the Old Bible" and "the New Testament." Now Mr. S. does not define what testaments the gospel embraces. If he say the Abrahamic and Mosaic, then he makes "the elements of the world" to which the Galatians again sought to be in bondage, a part of the good news; but if he say, the gospel embraces "the old bible" and "the new testament," then it embraces Rabshakeh's blasphemous speech against Jehovah, and Jeremiah's lamentations over the ruins of Zion, not to mention much other matter that has as much to do with the gospel as Jonah in the whale with Mohammed on camel-back in full flight for Mecca!

We agree with Mr. S. if he will alter one word in his proposition. If for "gospel" he will read scriptures, we will say, Amen, with reference to a certain result. As his words now stand, they declare precisely what our informant reports him to have said; for if the child of God is continually advancing in knowledge of the gospel and must necessarily do so, as he says, he never gets to the end; and is consequently "ever learning" it. This is what our informant says Mr. S. affirmed; and in effect, Mr. S. testifies that our informant was correct.

"A child of God must necessarily be continually advancing in the knowledge of the" scriptures, if he would grow in faith, and the grace or favor of God. There have been many, however, who have turned out to be what Peter styles, "cursed children who have forsaken the right way, and gone astray." This, of course, is not applicable to those who have never become children, and who have never been in the right way; but it shows us that men may even become children of God, and yet not "necessarily be continually advancing," in any Christian excellence or virtue. A man who becomes a child of God must of necessity understand and believe the gospel in order to become a child. An advancing child does not make a bonfire of God's promises, and deny the restoration of Israel. A child of God would not do this, unless he were about to become a cursed child; for the faith itself by which such a child is made is the belief of the promises. A child of God ignorant of the promises is a spiritual monstrosity. Of the children of God, it is written, "They shall be all taught of God."

God-enlightened people are neither ignorant nor deniant of his promises; and they are never found pleading for justification in ignorance.

As to the tests, we see nothing affirmed by Mr. S. that corrects anything said by our informant. The latter says as we have printed, "He denounced all tests whatever, saying they were human;" which is equivalent to saying, "he denounced all human tests." This is precisely what Mr. S. declares—"I denounced all human tests," says he. Our informant's "whatever" refers to human tests, these being the things in question at the moment.

Such is Mr. S.'s "correction," which, when put into the crucible and analyzed, corrects nothing. Our informant's accuracy is even endorsed by Mr. S. himself. As to Mr. S.'s contention for right of private judgment, every man determining for himself, and all that sort of thing, let him contend to his heart's content. What he contends for, we take the liberty of practising. We have judged privately in our study, and have determined for ourselves, what the gospel is that Paul preached; and being privately convinced that we ought to contend for it earnestly, and against all counterfeits, we exercise the right of carrying our judgment into effect. We try to compel them to come in by the force of testimony and argument. Yet with all the force we can bring to bear upon them, we say to them, Exercise your own independent judgment; determine for yourselves; be thoroughly convinced in your mind; if not, do not move a step; for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." But, if by right of private judgment, and so forth, Mr. S. means that we should keep our convictions of the truth to ourselves; and when we see others in publishing their convictions nullify that truth, we should keep silence, and leave our contemporaries to be imposed upon when we believe we could set them right—if this be the sort of policy we are expected to pursue, all such expectants will become heart-sick from hope deferred. The Gospel is a matter of life or death, and not to be trifled with to please, or save the feelings of any man. We can concede to others all we claim for ourselves—a clear stage and, no favor; so that at the end of the conflict, truth may be crowned the victor.

As to Mr. S.'s conclusion, his "correction" has furnished no evidence that our article is "a mis-statement from beginning to end." In default therefore of this we must leave it in statu quo. He regrets that our abilities and research are to be handed over to sectarianism and intolerance! He does not inform us, however, to which of the Sects of Anti-christendom we present them: Does he not read of "a Sect" in the New Testament "everywhere spoken against?" That sect "believed the things of the kingdom of God, and of the name of Jesus Christ;" and contended earnestly for them against all nullifiers and assailants. That sect knew nothing of "Christendom" and its "sentiments;" we therefore ignore them all. We neither tolerate them, nor ask to be tolerated by them, for they are "names of blasphemy," and nothing else.

Men may stem the mad schemes of errorism, and yet be errorists themselves. President Buchanan is not a whit nearer the truth because he is contending against "the furious currents of sectarian tyranny, and unlicensed cant of fanaticism" in Utah. A man may protest against creeds, and contend for the Bible as the only and sufficient rule of faith and practice, and not understand a first principle it contains. We know many instances of this; and that when their ignorance is demonstrated in the gentlest manner, they begin to cry out, "Sectarianism," "Intolerance!" "Right of private judgment!" "No creeds!" "No human tests"—transparent devices all to divert the unwary from the inconvenient and uncompromising obedience inculcated to the faith, anciently and once for all delivered to the saints. But the editor of the Herald is not to be moved by this uproar. We "berate" all who come to us, or our

generation, with any other gospel than Paul preached. An angel from heaven should not escape, if he turned editor of the Expositor and taught what we are satisfied is contrary to the truth. "Talents" cannot be better employed than in exposing the fallacies of those who mislead the people in spiritual affairs. Our pen has been at this work since 1834, so that the habit has become inveterate, and cannot be cured. Our course is a very single and straightforward one. The only question we ask is "What is the truth?" That found, and no one can prevent us from speaking it by flattery or intimidation. The truth must be spoken at all hazards, and no man shall hinder.

All of which is respectfully submitted by the
May 7, 1858.

EDITOR.

Analecta Epistolaria.

Queries.

BROTHER THOMAS, —The five numbers of the Herald came safely to hand, which I was greatly rejoiced even to see; but my joyfulness was greatly heightened when I had perused them. There are some articles from your pen, which for depth of thought and sublimity of sentiment, far exceed anything I have ever seen; and I have been considerable of a reader for a farmer.

Perhaps, dear sir, it is well for you that you have to endure the opposition of the clergy, the sects, and "the world." As Paul had a thorn in the flesh, lest he might become vain, and lifted up by reason of the revelations given to him; so you, by reason of the wisdom you possess in making plain to the understanding of the common people the mysteries of God, and the many flattering letters you receive, might make you take the glory to yourself, instead of giving it to God to whom the glory belongs. I say, perhaps it might if you had no persecution to endure; for the flesh is weak.

In all candor, I say it, that your writings have given me more instruction and satisfaction than that of any other man. I must have your work on the Apocalypse as soon as it is out of press. I do not know in these parts more than two persons beside myself who would read your writings. I must consider myself, however, a subscriber for your works so long as I can raise the needful.

If the righteous are to have no habitation in a heaven apart from the earth, please give us your views of 2 Cor., v. 1; also of 1 Pet. 1., 4; and of Eccl. xii., 7: which favor I ask of no vain curiosity; but to know the truth.

That God may long preserve you in usefulness to his cause and people, is the desire of your brother in Christ,

GEO. F. HENDRICKSON.

Bushnell, Ill.
May 3, 1858.

The Righteous in Heaven.

In 2 Cor. iv. 15, which is part of the context of ch. v. 1, Paul tells the Saints in Corinth and elsewhere, that "all things are for their sakes" These things he had already told them in 1 Cor. iii. 21-23, were "the world, life, death, things present, things to come; all yours," says he, "and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." Here are two classes of things, which, in 2 Cor. ix. 18, he designates as *προσκωρα* temporary, and *αιωνία* pertaining to the Aion—Messiah's Age, or the Millennium. "We look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporary; but the things which are not seen pertain to the Aion."

The unseen things are the object laid hold of by that faith which justifies; and are styled "the hope set before us in the Gospel," as appears from Paul's definition of faith, in Heb. xi. 1, saying that "faith is the full assurance (hypostasis) of things hoped for; the conviction of things unseen—unseen things hoped for.

These things make up "the world to come whereof," says Paul, "we speak"—Heb. ii. 5; and the reason why he and his brethren in Christ looked not at the temporary things around them, as matters of interest and ambition, such as statesmen, diplomatists, politicians, and the world's people are absorbed in, was because "they knew that if their earthly house of the tabernacle were dissolved, they have a building from God, a house not made with hand, *αιωνιον εν τοις ουρανοις* pertaining to the Aion in the heavens. It is a house *εξ ουρανου* from heaven *εν τοις ουρανοις* in the heavens: "the heaven" is therefore one place; and "the heavens" another.

The "heaven" is where Jesus is now; "the heavens" are where he will be when he reigns with his saints on Mount Zion and Jerusalem before his ancients gloriously. Isai. xxiv. 23. The things in the heavens are those things which are to be gathered together into one under Christ. Eph. i. 10; and termed by Daniel, "all dominions," which, he says, "shall serve and obey the Most High;" "which is the end of the matter." vii. 28. In other words, when the kingdoms of this world shall be Jehovah's and his Christ's," "the building of God, the house not made with hands," will have been built. The house, is "the stone cut out without hands," which demolishes the temporary scaffolding; and when it has finished the work to be done, "fills the whole earth." When we possess this kingdom and dominion "under the whole heaven," we shall, if saints, be clothed with glory, honor, incorruptibility, life, riches, power, which all pertain to the Aion, and to our house which is from heaven—"mortality swallowed up of life."

We shall at some future time speak more particularly of "the heavens;" suffice it for the present that all things therein are for the sake of all those who shall be accounted worthy of the kingdom of God to which "the Gospel of the kingdom" invites all who hear it. "All things are for your sakes"—all thrones, dominions, principalities, lordships, powers, peoples, nations, languages, and all their wealth in lands, cities, towns, villages, palaces; all the manufactures, shops and commerce of the world; yea, the earth and all the fulness thereof; "all is yours, O ye, the Saints of God;" for, in preaching the gospel He "who shall be called God of the whole earth" (Isai. liv. 5)—He himself proclaimed that "the meek shall inherit the earth," in the world to come. Surely when a man obtains the earth under that constitution of things "with the life of the Aion," he shall acquire a hundredfold for all the evil that any human obloquy and persecution can bring upon him; and, if such a glorious estate, with all the

delights and blessedness the presence of the Eternal Spirit will bring from his habitation of unapproachable light to the earth of his possession, be not a sufficient heaven for a poor miserable sinner redeemed from Adam's race, he is unworthy of a heaven; and deserves the eternal exclusion from the society of Him who will fill all in all. Persecution! What is persecution in view of such a recompense of reward? We are not practically ignorant of its meaning and inconvenience; and know that we are cordially hated and despised by nearly all, except those who perceive that we advocate the truth, and have themselves come to love it: but, while the good will of a dog is better than his enmity, there are some human dogs whose hostility is better than their praise. We know their falseness, and the mystery of their iniquity. Against this we contend, because it destroys the truth, hoodwinks the people, and glorifies deceit. It is natural enough that these curs should growl, and bite too when occasion serves; for by this craft they have their wealth. If we strip the deception of its veil, the bone is wrested from their teeth, and they fly at us in a rage. All this is very natural. They are dogs that cannot bark; and these are often more dangerous than noisier curs. We have had to do with such; and know practically the importance of Paul's advice, "Beware of dogs." But every great enterprise has its risks and dangers; these we despise, and are only solicitous of faithfulness to the end. Opposition is wholesome, persecution beneficial; anything is better than stagnation: therefore, when they come, "we rejoice, and are exceedingly glad: for great is our reward in the heavens; for so persecuted they the prophets" of the olden time—"in the heavens," even in those heavens, in which the House of David's tabernacle will appear "as in the days of old."

The passage in Peter reads in the original "stored up in heavens * * * to be apocalypsed (or revealed) in the last time." What is in store there? "An inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and unfading." But what is that inheritance? The kingdom and eternal glory to which men are invited in the gospel. 1 Thess. ii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 10. And where are they? "Under the whole heaven" when apocalypsed. Dan. vii. 27; which is "the end of the matter."

"The spirit shall return to the mighty Ones that gave it." This is true of the spirit of every quadruped that dies; for the same writer says in the same book, "they (men and beasts) have all one spirit (ruach). Eccl. iii. 19.

EDITOR.

The Clerical Son of a Ghost in Skyvana Rejected, and the Jesus Paul Preached Obeyed.

DEAR SIR: In my last I informed you that I was about to return to Port Perry; and I now proceed to inform you of the progress of the truth in that place.

There is a church there of between twenty and thirty members, calling themselves "the church of God;" and believing in the Age to come, restoration of the Jews, reappearance of Christ, and the establishment of his Kingdom in the Covenanted land. But I found that they lacked one thing, viz., the obedience of the faith. The most of them there take "The Expositor;" in which I am sorry to see friend Marsh take such a sophistical stand against that enlightened obedience which the one faith demands, seeing that he is the means of keeping back many honest hearts from "obeying the truth," as many of them look up to him as their oracle. How glad should I be to see him obey the truth; as I think that through "the Expositor" he is operating as a stumbling-block to some who would otherwise obey; and his conversion would move it out of the way. But it appears that he has taken a stand, and that he will still hold to it, though defeated by argument and testimony, as can clearly be seen, ever so often. I never read any of his writings until within a few months. I rejoice to see so much truth shine

out as does from among the error it contains. On the gospel and its obedience, however, he displays a vast amount of weakness, in order to support and defend the position occupied by "the children of disobedience." I endeavored to show some of this class who follow his traditions so congenial to the flesh, the fallacy and sophistry of his reasonings, as presented in an article written by him in the February number of "The Expositor," the result of which may appear hereafter.

I delivered nineteen lectures more at this visit, on the kingdom, as being the great matter of faith and hope, of both prophets and apostles. I laid before them the necessity of understandingly believing and obeying the truth, by showing from the scriptures, that to believe in Christ is to believe the future concerning him as well as the past—to believe in the message, as well as in the messenger. Luke iv. 43. That to believe in the Son of God promised to the Jewish nation, was to believe him to be the King of Israel, and heir to David's throne. This was the Son that the Eunuch believed in; for he was reading from Isaiah the prophet, which prophet declared, that the son promised was heir to David's throne and kingdom; and to reign over the house of Jacob.

To believe in "the Son" of Isaiah, and the Son of Sectarian Theology, is not to believe in the same person.

I laid before them, that if they were Christ's sheep, and had heard his voice (through his word), they would follow his, and not the voice of strangers, or strange voices apart from the word; for to follow Jesus was to believe what he taught, and to do what he commanded. "He that believeth the gospel and is baptized shall be saved." This is the voice of the shepherd; not be immersed first, and afterwards believe the Gospel. This is a strange voice; a turning of things upside down, and perverting the right way of the Lord. I showed them that the gospel was contained in "the great and precious promises" (yet future) "by which we are made partakers of the divine nature." This gospel, preached by Philip to the Samaritans, is shown forth to be "the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ." Query. Did Philip preach a different doctrine to the Eunuch before baptizing him? Acts xxviii. 23-31. The same gospel was preached by Paul, who styles it in Rom. i. 16, "the power of God unto salvation;" it was "the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus;" not simply the Name. I laid before them also, that to become the children of God they must be "begotten by the incorruptible seed; the word which by gospel was preached" to those whom Peter wrote in 1 Pet. i. 2, 3-25; which incorruptible seed was sown by Jesus Christ, and from which the children of the kingdom are produced. Matt, xiii. 38. In this seed is the germ from which we become the children of God. This Seed being "the word of the kingdom," understood, Matt. xiii. 19, 23, we ought to perceive the necessity of going to the right shop to obtain the genuine seed; and not to the mock auctions of the present day, where the Peter Funks palm off a spurious article upon the world.

The kingdom preached by Christ and the apostles was a world-punishing, but not a world-annihilating kingdom. It was a kingdom to be set up in the Holy Land, under the Supremacy of the Immortalized Jesus and his saints, ruling the nations in righteousness, Rev. ii. 26, 27.

I showed them, that faith in the kingdom was indispensable for the putting on of Christ in Baptism; "for without faith (in the kingdom and the name) it is impossible to please God," this being the thing hoped for. I showed them also, that to be united to the vine the union could only be effected upon the principle of faith; for without the true faith, there can be no

life to unite to the stock; that the grafting in takes place when we become united to the Name of the Holy Ones in the obedience of faith: then we become united to the Abrahamic stock; and are no more strangers to the covenants of promise. I showed them also, that as Noah by faith entered the ark (being warned of things not seen as yet) so the believer in the things of the kingdom and name, enters the antitypical ark, Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21, in which alone we can be preserved, when the judgments are poured out upon a godless and a Christless world.

These lectures having a good effect upon some good and honest hearts, six who had been previously immersed into the theological sonship, and world-burning theory of Antichrist, came forward and were baptized into the one faith. In the whole I baptized fourteen into the Name of the Holy Ones, who are now rejoicing in hope of the glory of God. Since then I delivered eight lectures in Whitby to attentive audiences; but with what effect, must be left to the revelation of the good God, who giveth the increase in due time.

I am now about to lecture again in Scarbro; and I find that the good seed there has not been scattered in vain.

Hoping that your valuable life may be spared to labor in the vineyard.

I remain sir, yours in the Hope of Israel,

S. WILLIAMS.

Toronto, C. W.
May 1, 1858.

The Kingdom First.

Dear Brother Thomas: —Friend Marsh's article on "Valid Immersion" (in Expositor for 1856) has shaken the confidence, and some of the respect, which he had earned in these parts before.

I am surprised that he should so tenaciously insist upon his views of preaching what he terms "Christ," before "the kingdom." For in Abraham's case, he was not only commanded to, but into the land (or kingdom territorial) he came before ever "the promise of the Seed" was even hinted at. It was even eight or ten years subsequent to his migration before the covenant was confirmed by the oath of "two immutable things," upon the appreciation of which he was pronounced "justified on account of his faith" in the promises of the land (or kingdom proper) and the Seed.

It is really astonishing that he cannot get this squint out of his vision. I fear he will not see. May the Lord open his eyes!

Wishing you all success in winning souls, and the reward of the just, with kindest remembrances to yourself and family, believe me yours sincerely in the Hope of the Kingdom and Glory.

JAMES LUXFORD.

Richmond, Va.

In a Mystery.

Dr. Thomas: — Although I am not a member of any Denomination; yet I should be more gratified to see and hear you lecture than any minister whatever. Your views are altogether different from those of the Denominations; and yet, I can understand the scriptures better by reading one page, than I can by sitting hours and listening to others, for they only leave me in a mystery. I should like so much to hear you discourse on the resurrection here in Western Virginia. I should like to get your work on the Apocalypse, and see your views, for it is a perfect mystery to me.

Most respectfully yours,

S. J. GALLION.

Feb. 23, 1858.

Hunger in the Desert.

Dear Brother: — The Heralds have not found their way here yet. I am hungering in this desert for a portion of meat in due season. That which can be obtained in the soul-markets here is not worth sitting down to eat. It is revoltingly unwholesome to minds that know what the truth is.

Yours faithfully,

JOHN SWAN.

Cambridge, 0.

Encouragement.

Dear Brother: — I am requested by one of your readers to forward you five dollars for the Herald. She is so interested in its general course and bearing that she feels disposed to assist in its publication. She often remarks, "If Dr. Thomas has not the truth, I don't know who has."

The things you unfold are "deep things," and still of interest to me; and I may say for your encouragement to several others in this quarter. That you may be blessed by, and succeed in developing the truth, is my prayer.

Yours in Hope of the Kingdom,

N. M. CATLIN.

Smith's Basin, N. Y.

Light Wanted.

Brother Thomas: — Having become acquainted with the Herald of the Kingdom; and having received much instruction from its lucid expositions of scripture, I have, as might be expected, a strong desire to continue the perusal of it. I wish you to send me all the back numbers containing that excellent article entitled "The Mosaic and Nazarene Teaching Concerning God."

I am a believer in the Gospel of the Kingdom. I believe that Jesus the Anointed will, at the Times of the Restitution of all things, spoken of by all the prophets, "return to earth; gather together the scattered tribes of Israel; reinstate them in their own land; and, setting up the throne of his father David, will sit thereon and execute judgment and justice in the earth. I

believe also, that the Saints immortalized will be associated with Israel's King in the government; and so forth.

Into this faith I have been immersed; and I pray God, that I may continue steadfast unto the end. There are no believers here besides myself. I am acquainted with one man, however, who says he believes in the reign of Christ on earth; but he does not seem to attach much importance to the doctrine. He is a Methodist.

I would gladly instruct the people here in the things concerning the Kingdom of God; but their ears are dull of hearing. But send along the Herald; and perhaps that will reflect some light upon their minds which are very dark.

And by the way, I want some light too, on two passages of Scripture. The first is Jno. xiv. 2, 3. In this, Jesus speaks as if he were going to prepare a place away from the earth; and yet other scriptures teach plainly that the earth is to be the dwelling place of the Saints. The next text is 1 Cor. xv. 22: "for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ will all be made alive." Will all the heathen who have never heard the gospel; and all those who have died in infancy, be raised from death? And if raised, will they share the fate of those who have rejected the gospel?

I would like to have you explain Matt, xxiv. 34, when you get time. There are other passages which I would like to have expounded, but I will trouble you with no more at present.

Yours in the One Hope,

JOHN W. NILES.

Warren Co. Pa.
May 9, 1858.

The printer has omitted our reply, which will appear in our next.

EDITOR.

Theiopolitical.

Discovery of a new Plot to Assassinate the Emperor of the French.

Paris (April 6) Correspondent of the Manchester Guardian.

IT is now positively certain to all those who have any means of knowing what passes behind the scenes, that the ceremony of opening the Boulevard de Sebastopol, was put off on account of the discovery of a fresh plot to assassinate the Emperor. The details of the affair are kept in the utmost possible mystery, and are probably only known to the new Prefect of Police, General Espinasse, and the Emperor himself; but the mere fact of the existence of the plot is known to some hundreds of individuals, and it has even caused a modification in the ceremonial of yesterday, whereof a trace is to be found in this morning's Moniteur. The official paper, alluding to the name of the new Boulevard, says, "It was quite right that a muster of troops should mark the inauguration of such an artery of the capital, and, after the Emperor, our soldiers were the first who ought to have trodden a soil bearing the name of so glorious a victory." This, as you will see, is a manner of explanation for the presence of all the troops that were called together yesterday. In the origin, the ceremony was to be a purely civil and municipal one; but, when it was discovered that so great a danger threatened, it was

resolved to change its character altogether, and instead of a municipal, it became a military fete. Connected with this, I can relate to you a curious circumstance that has just occurred, and for which I can vouch. Last week, one of the very highest placed functionaries here, and one of the nearest, if not the nearest, in habitual confidence to the Emperor Napoleon III, called upon a lady friend of mine, with whom, and with whose husband, he has been upon intimate terms of friendship for the last fourteen years. Both this lady and her husband are foreigners, settled in Paris. The person I speak of made the visit in question on purpose to ask these friends of his what property they had preserved in their own country, and how far they had identified their fortunes with those of France; and the language he held was textually this: "With all that my position obliges me to know, I cannot reconcile it to my long-standing friendship for you and yours not to enlighten you upon the reality of the situation we are, all of us, now living in France. The Emperor's existence is an all but impossible one; he is so surrounded by plots that every day brings to light, so compelled now to suspect the very individuals who serve him in the interior of the palace, that it is next to a positive miracle that he should escape. His own faith in his preservation is shaken; and from day to day, from hour to hour, anything may happen in Paris, and Paris become a place where no one who is not forced to live should be desirous of prolonging his stay. All this may not occur—it is possible that nothing of it at all may happen; but it is just as possible that it may all occur any day; and that being the real state of affairs here, I cannot reconcile it to myself not to warn you, and not to advise you to be always ready to leave this country at a moment's notice." *

If I could name to you the man who uttered these words, you would at once see that, unless they were pronounced by Louis Napoleon himself, they could not be so by any one more important. I confess my own impression is, not that the plots for assassination will succeed in their direct and present form, but I firmly believe they have another danger, which is every bit as great, and which is evident to some few of those who live in Louis Napoleon's intimacy. The notion of an incessant and horrible danger hanging over his head has so possessed the Emperor, that in spite of all his resolves to the contrary, his nervous system is shaken to the roots, and he is in that peculiar state of mind that prevents a man from seeing straight or moving straight. He no longer enjoys his liberty of action or of thought, and his own mistaken acts it will be that will probably one day bring a fatal crisis on.

* Those who know not the scripture must be in doubt. We know that the crisis will come, and that the French Empire will vanish when, as the Frog-Power, its mission shall be accomplished—this is to stir up war by which Russia will come into the position indicated, Turkey will be divided, Jerusalem occupied by Russia, British in occupation of Edom and Moab—a situation indicative that the Lord is about to appear as a thief. —Editor.

England and France.

THE London correspondent of the New York Commercial is determined to see symptoms of eventual hostile collision between England and France, and commences his letter under date April 9th, thus: —

"The reign of commercial dullness and political distrust continues. Not a single event of any importance has taken place since the departure of the Arago, but those minor indications which have long been gathering, and which seem all to point to one conclusion, namely, the determination of Louis Napoleon to support his despotism by a war with England, still accumulate from day to day.

"There are those, however, who do not participate in these apprehensions, and who treat each hint of such a possibility as something too ridiculous for argument. The general public, however, no longer echo their views. The peace party, with that self-complacent blindness which distinguished them previously to the Russian war, join in the happy delusion; but among all other persons there is a growing sense of the crisis that is impending.

"The first signal of the struggle may come at any moment, since nothing could be plainer than that a pretext is now all that is waited for. The refugee difficulty failed to answer the purpose at the time, but even that is still looked to as capable of affording the necessary material for a rupture, in case no other subject should offer that will involve a less flagrant disregard of decency. When Count Walewski withdrew from further discussion on the point, he left it to the people of England to do what was requisite. Therefore, they are not likely to do anything, and the charge can at any time be raised that they have repaid the generous reliance of the Emperor by an insulting indifference. In the hands of Marshal Pellissier a reclamation of this kind will not be frittered down by delicate handling. But it is evidently hoped that some covert and diplomatic cause of rupture may be found without delay. The British occupation of the isle of Perim is the topic just seized, and either this or some movement against Austria in Italy, will perhaps meet the exigencies of the occasion."

Perim.

THE British Government having taken possession of an uninhabited rock called Perim, lying in the strait of Babel Mandeb, at the mouth of the Red Sea, and on the direct "overland" route from England to her East Indian Empire, some of the opposition presses of France are denouncing the act as an insult to the sovereignty of Turkey. To this and other objections the London Times replies as follows: —

"English steamers, as we have said, are passing and repassing the entrance of the Red Sea daily. No other European flag ever appears on the waters of this tropical gulf. Neither France nor Russia, nor Austria has the slightest concern with it. It is in the exclusive occupation of England, and must in the nature of things remain so as long as England has vast possessions beyond it, and these other countries have none at all. Perim, which is advantageously situate at a point where the navigation is difficult, has been an uninhabited rock, except at rare intervals, since the creation of the world. It was occupied when Sir David Baird was about to invade Egypt from India, nearly sixty years ago, and when, a few months back, our people returned, they found, we are told, the fortifications and reservoirs just as their grandfathers left them. And yet, because we form a settlement on this desert rock in a sea where no flag but our own ever comes, we must listen to an outburst of spite from the Continental press? We are to forego the possession of a spot which is untenanted by any human being, and which is found to be a convenient halting-place for our mail-steamers and transports, simply out of deference to the susceptibilities of continental politicians, who have not the smallest interest in those regions of the world, and who never heard the name of Perim in their lives. Perim may be necessary for the intercourse between Europe and Asia, but Perim must be left desolate because France thinks that the occupation will too much increase the influence of England on the Arabian and Abyssinian coasts. This is what the science of politics has come to among the publicists of the second Empire!"

England and Prance—Probability of War.

From the London Correspondence of the New York Commercial Advertiser.

AFFAIRS are going on quietly, but distrust is still universal. Money is obtainable on the Stock Exchange at the rate of 2 per cent per annum, yet the funds are nearly stagnant, the slightest rally that might occur being immediately followed by a reaction. On the French Bourse any sustained rise seems out of the question. And all this is occurring when, even apart from the influx of gold both in Paris and London, every political event should, if we might exclude the idea of long meditated treachery on the part of the Emperor of France, contribute to inspire confidence. The Chinese war may be considered to have long since terminated, and this week, with the final intelligence of the capture and complete occupation of Lucknow, the Indian struggle has assumed a more manageable phase.

On the continent, Italy, however discontented, has no thought of running herself against the steady wall of Austrian bayonets. Austria herself has for the moment no wish but for repose. Prussia is proverbially quiet and conservative. Spain is beneath notice, and Russia professes peace with the most obtrusive amiability. Where then is the cause for anxiety? That which was plainly stated two months ago, is now becoming a recognized conviction on all sides. A war forced upon us by France is admitted by almost all to be possible, and by many to be probable.

The extent to which this conclusion has gained ground was extraordinarily illustrated three nights since in a discussion in the House of Commons on the navy estimates. The House was unanimous on the necessity for vigorously sustaining our defences, and however guarded each speaker might endeavor to be, it was rendered apparent that one thought was predominant in every mind, namely, that the gigantic preparations across the channel are beyond all precedent, and can have but a single object.

Of course the members of the Cabinet endeavored as far as possible to disguise their belief that the Emperor has any ill designs, by suggesting that however much we might place reliance on his good faith, we had no guarantee that his rule would be permanent, and that this was the reason why we should be on our guard; they all admitted that the signs of danger from France were too palpable to be disowned or neglected.

Independent members took a plainer tone. In every large assembly there are always two or three members who win fame by a blunt eccentricity which conies at last to be tolerated and relished, a sort of understanding being adopted that they are to be regarded as privileged persons, and that the general body are not to be compromised by anything they may say. Occasionally they utter great nonsense; mostly, however, in an amusing way, and still more frequently there is a method in their madness which causes them to expose truths that routine minds are sure to miss.

Among personages of this class in the British House of Commons, Mr. Drummond, the banker, reigns supreme, and on the French question he indulged freely in his peculiar vein. Advising the country to take lessons from experience, he reminded us that it has always been the practice of Louis Napoleon to act by coups de main. Did we suppose we should receive from him a declaration of war and then a month's notice? He knows his own business a great deal too well for that, and it is our task to be prepared. But it is the habit of our people to refuse to believe in hostile designs, even when they are fairly warned of them. The Emperor

of Russia told us he would seize Constantinople, and yet not one single soul in Lord Aberdeen's Cabinet would believe a word of it. In like manner, said Mr. Drummond, the Emperor Napoleon has made his intentions plain. He had always told us a time might come when we should irritate his people, and provoke his army to such an extent that he might not be able to restrain them. And what was he doing now? Was not the very existence of Cherbourg, with all its powder, just like a man who held up his fist in your face and said, "I have not touched you; you have no cause to be angry—have I not a right to hold my arm where I choose?"

What were all his preparations for? Was there the smallest chance of his having any naval war except with us? Finally Mr. Drummond suggested a contingency which, of course, coming from him, could be received as a cheerful play of fancy, but which will nevertheless, perhaps, awaken a considerable amount of unacknowledged anxiety. "It may not be a proper question to ask, but were we free from a coup de main which would take Malta and Gibraltar before we knew anything about the matter? and then we should receive two days afterwards a telegram to say that we had lost them."

The State of Feeling in France.

From the New York Times.

THE following extract from a private letter has been handed to us for publication by the gentleman to whom it was addressed by his correspondent in Paris. The writer is a man of rank in the world of letters, as well as in the society of the French capital, not absolutely identified with any of the extreme opinions which divide and distract the intellect of France, and enabled, by the universal esteem in which he is held, to command the confidence of men of the most opposite political convictions:

"Our politics are somewhat less than when I wrote to you a few weeks since, yet their general tenor is alarming. The public feeling, especially in the Army and Navy, has become openly and violently hostile to England. The occupation of Perim, which implies an absolute and arbitrary domination in the Red Sea, offers a fair pretext of complaint, and Pelissier's nomination to London—although it has pleased superficial and unreasoning observers to term it a compliment to the British valor and to the British alliance—is rather a threat and a military reconnaissance, under an affectation of fairness and cordiality.

"Pelissier himself has more cunning than violence—he is quite unprincipled, sanguinary, and one of those military chiefs who may (and must, whenever the circle of our revolutionary movements is to be put again in motion) covet and dispute the possession of supreme power to attain which foreign war and internal compression will be employed most unscrupulously. He is notably a Republican, but both Legitimists and Orleanists fancy that they can count on him.

"We cannot be on good terms with Austria much longer, for that Power, intimately connected with England, is openly thwarting all our purposes and real or imaginary interests in the East.

"The affairs of Italy remain in a state of most painful suspense. The hypocritical devotion of our government to the Papal interest forbids the hope that any essential amelioration can be effected in that country at present, and the peril of allowing that unhappy

and distracted portion of Europe to be driven to utter despair has been lately exhibited, and may be yet more clearly exhibited, in renewed attempts at assassination."

It will be observed that this letter confirms, in the strongest language, the reported success of the Emperor's attempt to awaken the sleeping Anglo-phobism of the Parisians, and that he points to the question of the Island of Perim as an available issue upon which a quarrel with Great Britain may be mooted. The commercial and manufacturing classes of France can hardly be expected to oppose an effectual resistance to any measure which can command the enthusiasm of the army and navy; and, as the English government will most assuredly refuse to recede from its positions in the East, the vague rumors of difficulty and collision between the Western Allies, which have been prevalent ever since the 14th of January, will soon begin to concentrate about the Oriental question. A speedy disruption of friendly relations between France and Austria is also spoken of, our readers will observe, as an impending certainty, and the support afforded by Austria to England in the East is alleged as the overt ground of this further complication in the diplomatic world. We have already called attention to the evident alienation of France from Austria, and to the coincident strengthening of the bonds which unite England with Prussia. It is worthy of notice, now, that Austria has recently manifested an unusually friendly disposition towards her rival at North Germany, and that the Vienna Cabinet has even shown some willingness to yield to the policy of Berlin in the grave economical questions which have long been debated between the two courts. The actual aspect of European affairs is, therefore, not less cloudy and menacing than the internal condition of France herself; and it would really appear that Napoleon III, is rapidly gambling away the vast influence which he had acquired for himself and his country by six years of extraordinary and skilful administration. For whatever the seeming strength of such a dynasty as his may be, the stupendous nature of the financial expedients by which he has maintained himself is thoroughly appreciated throughout Europe, and the eventual results of them are still regarded as more than doubtful. England, on the other hand, commands all the influence, invaluable at critical epochs in history, which inheres in the general conviction that her resources are inexhaustible, and that her institutions are solidly founded upon a basis which no revolution can shake. France at peace under a Napoleon allied with England, and France at war without the support and countenance of England, are two very different phenomena, and there can be no reasonable doubt that the symptoms, growing daily more and more evident, of coming troubles in the home affairs and the foreign relations of France are already producing their natural effect in the gradual alienation of all the Continental Courts. Russia, herself, with all her bitterness against Austria and England, can hardly be relied on as a cordial friend to the master of the Duc de Malakoff. She has been coquetting with France ever since the peace of Paris; but with the hope of estranging the Emperor from his great ally on the other side of the channel, and Napoleon III, can hardly be so unversed in the wiles of women and of Kings, as to suppose that Russia will put herself to the pains of remembering any troublesome promises after she shall have attained the object with which these promises were made. An Italian coup d'etat might possibly release Napoleon from the most dangerous embarrassments of his position. Neither England nor Prussia could very well tender support to Austria in a collision brought by her oppressive policy in Italy, and by a French intervention in the interest of Italian liberty and independence. Such a collision would find Austria in the complete isolation which now threatens France herself. But the policy of Napoleon III., in the Roman States, and his recent but unsuccessful attempt to coerce Sardinia into his "system of repression," are serious obstacles to his taking such a step. He has indeed brought France into such a position by various measures of domestic and foreign policy, that while a foreign war seems to have become his only refuge from a revolution at his palace gates, it is impossible for him to make any serious war, which will not expose France, alone and unsupported, to the shock of a

formidable alliance, and awaken her dreams of another sunrise of Austerlitz to the reality of another and a sadder sunset of Waterloo.

Miscellanea.

A Jew Churchwarden and Advowsons.

AT the Easter Vestry held on Tuesday last, at the Parish of St. Margaret, New Fish Street, Mr. Keeling, of Hebrew faith, was reflected Senior Churchwarden for the fourth year, in conjunction with others as Overseers. The Rector, who presided at the Vestry, expressed his gratification at the re-election of Mr. Keeling, who had performed his duties most advantageously to all concerned. Mr. Keeling, in reply, stated that his creed taught him that the various and solemn offices of public religion were duties of indispensable moral obligation, and that they form the best groundwork of society, the foremost prop of government, and the fairest ornament of both; and he felt sure such views could never be inimical to Protestant interests, either religious or political."—London Leader, April 10, 1858.

As churchwardens are rare birds in this western world since George-the-Third Religion was kicked out of these heavens by Democracy, it may be well to explain to our readers of this generation, what a churchwarden is. This is necessary to the understanding and due appreciation of the bearings of our extract from the Leader. A churchwarden, then, is a man annually elected in all the parishes of England to look after the church, churchyard, and such things as belong to both; and to look after the behavior of the parishioners, who are assumed to be all members of the church. Hence, a churchwarden is a "Christian" functionary; and constitutes an element of what is styled "the Vestry" — an assembly of "Christians" at whose meetings the Parish Pope, the chief "Christian of the parish, called "the Rector," presides. Now churchwardens, rectors, vestries, clerical robes, providing the bread and wine for "the sacrament," parishioners, and so forth, are "Christian" consecrated and dedicated things; and are all in their institution based upon the principle that "Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ." Without the establishment of this principle, none of these things would have existed; and England would have been at this day worshipping the gods and goddesses of the Saxons. In so far, then, clerical blasphemy is an improvement upon Saxon idolatry with its orgies.

But what have we here in the Rectory of St. Margaret? A Hebrew, who denies the Messiahship of Jesus, playing the part of a "Christian" functionary, looking after and taking care of "the sacred things" which declare that Jesus is the Christ of God. And the Rev. Rector highly approves of the practical hypocrisy of the Jew, "who," he testifies, "had performed his duties most advantageously to all concerned!" Now, who can say that the Christianity of St. Margaret's, London, is not liberal and charitable in the extreme? Would it say to Mr. Keeling, who performs the duties of his "christian" office so well, "thou must confess that Jesus is Lord and Christ, or thou canst not be saved?" "Thou canst not enter into the kingdom of God?" Nay, for upon the Episcopal principles, he is already in the kingdom, being in the church, because churchwarden of the same! Practically, then, we learn from the case before us, that faith in Jesus, as much as even the demons had in the first century, is not necessary for membership, nor for salvation; nay more, that a Jew may deny that Jesus is Christ—not only be without faith on account of ignorance—passively faithless; but may actively deny him, and be saved! And why not? Does not the Victoria-Religion, and not that only; do not all the "Names and Denominations" of "Christians" send babies, and Socrates, and Plato, and gallows-scoundrels to glory who have neither knowledge nor faith; why then should they not

send respectable, because rich, and therefore profitable, Jews to keep them company, upon the basis simply of the performance of duties advantageous to the church?

But the curiosity of the thing is, that Mr. Keeling, the Hebrew rejecter of Jesus, can act as a "Christian" parish officer with advantage to all concerned in St. Margaret Christianity, a "successor of the apostles," and "an ambassador of Jesus Christ," as the Rev. Rector deems himself, being judge; while the said rector's brethren and superiors of the Episcopal Bench in the House of Lords raise a great clamor against the admission of a non-christian Jew to a seat in the House of Commons, which is made up of atheists, infidels, papists, and men of all sorts of contradictory creeds, on the plea that the admission of such an one to represent the people, "would unchristianize the legislature!" So it has come to this, that an unbelieving and conscientious Jew would unchristianize the legislature; but that an unbelieving Jew, of easy conscience, would not unchristianize the church! From this we should conclude, that the church is a fouler den than even the House of Commons; for that is certainly the purer which is in a state capable of being defiled by a purer thing. The Church is already so defiled that a denial of the Messiahship of Jesus will not defile it? But the British Legislature is so pure and unsullied that if a Jew denying Jesus were to refuse to qualify himself to sit down with the atheists by swearing "on the faith of a Christian," this conscientiousness proving the Jew to be a better man than the churchwarden, would not save it from defilement! But, how little Christian vitality must the Legislature contain if one Jew representative can nullify 24 bishops, two archbishops, the representatives of the Clerical Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and all the pretenders to Christianity besides in the Upper and Lower House; all basking in the sunshine of the Woman clothed with the sun, wearing a crown of stars, and the moon of the British Heavens under her feet! An atheist among the number will not unchristianize the legislature; but a Jew believing in Christ and in God, and refusing to perjure himself but denying that Jesus is that Christ, will! What a legislature! O what hypocrites, what spiritual knaves it is composed of!

But non-Nazarene Jews have more intimate relations with the Victoria Church than Mr. Churchwarden Keeling. They have money vested in it. This is well known to the "lords spiritual" of the Upper house, and to all the world. The kind of church property owned by Jews who reject the claims of Jesus is called "Advowson," or the right to present to a benefice. Thus, suppose a parish of 100,000 souls, "precious immortal souls," as the clerical soul merchants style them. That parish has a temple they call "a church," which is dedicated to a saint of the calendar, who is considered by the faithful as the celestial guardian of the parish. Hence, in Daniel, these parish churches are styled *mivtzerai mahuzzim*, BAZAARS OF GUARDIANS. —places of merchandize dedicated to "guardian saints." The only man who has any right to auction off spiritual merchandize in these bazaars is "the parson of the parish," styled a rector or vicar; or one he may appoint as his deputy, called a curate. Any dull fellow will do for this trade, as all that is necessary is ability to read; his routine is to read dead men's prayers published 300 years ago, and "commanded to be read in churches," by the King in Council; and to read other men's compositions, called "sermons," (or his own, if he have brains enough to make them) which he may obtain of any theological publisher at so much a dozen! Now for drawling in "a holy tone" over this print and "zigzag manuscript" on the day of the week dedicated by his pagan ancestors to the sun, in the parish bazaar at weddings, baby rhantisms, funerals, sacrament, and other "services," to all of which there is a bousy looking sinner appointed, called "a clerk," to sing-song "Amen!"—for doing this, or for having it done, which Victoria-Religionists term "Divine Service;" said rector or vicar by tithes, and other impositions, is provided with a stall of several hundred pounds a year.

But a boy imbued at Oxford and Cambridge with Greek and Latin paganism, and trained in hypocrisy for the State Church cannot enter upon this fat living except by gift or purchase. The fee simple proprietorship in the living is in the owner of the Advowson. If the boy be the owner he can send a curate to "do duty" at a few pounds a year (scarcely enough to feed Balaam's ass,) and when of canonical age, he can if he please, present himself; or, still keep the bazaar-man, pay him his pittance, and spend the rest of the profits on his own lusts in Paris or elsewhere. In Paris, his reverence is "a fast young man," and making himself very popular among the Parisians (which is not to be effected by a protestant divine without profligacy and expense,) he becomes embarrassed, and has to apply to the Jews for relief. These liberal traders are always ready to help a Christian soul-merchant in distress, provided he have any available assets. Our youthful divine has his advowson. The Rectory brings him in £450 a year, the interest of £15,000 at 3 per cent. His present necessities are great, and he bargains it off to a Jew for £10,000 or perhaps less. In this way the Victoria-Judas sells the Victoria-Jesus to the Jews for pieces of silver. But what is the Jew purchaser to do with this piece of "Christian" property? He cannot don the canonicals without swearing faith in the Thirty-nine Articles of Victoria Religion, which he does not believe. A Jew's conscience will not allow him to do this; but the conscience of Gentiles paganised at Oxford and Cambridge for the Church, has no scruples to overcome. Its standard of right is expediency. It is expedient to swear for the sake of the loaves and fishes. Few believe the articles; but then, there are the fat livings, which cannot be reached by the advowsonless without swearing. Gentiles swear that they believe, and will maintain, and preach the Thirty-Nine Articles which constitute their creed, while they are either ignorant of them, or positively disbelieve them. Speaking of these fellows and their system, Lord Chatham said, "it was a popish liturgy, a Calvinic creed, and an Arminian clergy"—in plain English, a system of hypocrisy and falsehood. The Jew will not swear, and call God to witness that he swears the truth, that he believes what he despises in his heart, for the sake even of £450 a year; but the Victoria clergy will. But if he cannot qualify himself by a false oath "to preach and administer ordinances," he can continue the journeyman soul-dealer at the parish bazaar, pay him his allowance, and pocket the balance.

In this way the 100,000 souls are sold to the Jews! They can sell an advowson to any mal-principled Gentile, who has sworn in due form to the Calvinistic Thirty-Nine; or impose a curate upon the parish, who will say as little for "the Jesus Paul preached," as possible. And such is a specimen of the system, which in England is the Christianity established by law; and recognized as such, as the religion of Jesus Christ, by all the protestant world. It is the parent also of American Episcopacy, which still rejoices in the intimacy of a common faith. But who, except a clergyman and the unfortunates he deludes, but slightly acquainted with the first principles of New Testament doctrine can mistake the State Superstition of Britain for Christianity! There is not the faintest resemblance between the two systems, either in doctrine, worship, constitution, or morals. It is on the contrary, an awful system of blasphemy—"a Name of Blasphemy" nevertheless, to be preferred as an ecclesiastical police organization to the horrible superstition and cruel despotism under which the nations groan on the Continent of Europe. This is the "MOTHER of Harlots and of ALL the Abominations of the Earth;" a mother worthy of the kings and clergy who sustain her: her harlot progeny do not, indeed, violate the decencies of life, and oppress liberty so brutally as she; they are, notwithstanding, still ecclesiastical prostitutes—the defiling women of Rev. xiv. 4. All State Churches are essentially and constitutionally "harlots;" for a State is a sin-organization in all its elements and details; a religion, therefore, no matter how pure in itself loses its virginity, and becomes a harlot, the instant it forms an alliance with a government of the Gentiles. These remarks do not apply to the Mosaic system, nor to that hereafter to be established by

Messiah. These are Theocracies. The kingdoms and republics of the world, Protestant, Papal, Greek, Mohammedan, American or Pagan, are the State organizations of the unmeasured Court of the Gentiles—the provincial jurisdictions of Satan's Empire. The spiritual systems established and sustained by these are the superstitious of Antichrist, and have nothing hallowing or saving in them. On the contrary, they are defiling; and he that is of the saved has no fellowship or sympathy with them. Of such in the scripture referred to above, it is said that "they were not defiled with women, for they are virgins." They were not defiled with the Apocalyptic Harlots, of which the Church, over which Victoria presides as the Defendress of its Faith, is the most Laodicean—a perfect synagogue of Satan, to be captured and destroyed. EDITOR.

Absurd Clerical Speculation.

THE following appeared in a New York paper, under the caption of "The Locality of Heaven." An English "DIVINE," "the Rev." G. S. Faber is said to have published a work on this subject, in which if the extract contained in this article is a specimen of the whole, he has written himself down a prince of the long eared philosophers. He believes that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God; but what nonsense to talk of such an one understanding or believing the Gospel, to say nothing of teaching it for the "cure of souls!" This "Reverend Divine" is a writer upon the Apocalypse! The following is the article:

"The whole discussion he bases on an interpretation of the passage: 'In my Father's house are many mansions. If it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.' John xiv. 2.

"In his interpretation of John xiv. 2, he says that the house of the Father is 'the real temple of the Omni-present,' 'the immense mundane house of God;' the many mansions are the many spheres, planetary and stellar, which astronomy reveals to us; and the place which our Lord promised to prepare for his disciples, is this planet of ours, in a restored and perfected condition, as one of the many mansions. He thinks that we have a full scriptural warrant for the belief that the Hades, where he contends that the disembodied spirits of men, both the good and the bad, are detained, entering neither heaven nor hell till the resurrection, is a receptacle beneath the surface of the very earth on which we now dwell, and that the compartment of it allotted to the righteous, as well as the one allotted to the wicked, will, by the fires of the last day, melt into and become a part and parcel of the Gehenna of the day of judgment. He thinks that the righteous, after beholding the destruction of this planet from some lofty height, in the clouds, to which they are to be caught up, immediately after the resurrection, will descend again to its surface, renovated and restored to the paradisaical state; and that this is the place which the Saviour promised to prepare for his faithful followers. We give his own words:

" 'But when the day of judgement, at the second advent of our Lord, shall arrive, then will take place the general resurrection, both of the holy and of the unholy. At that season the present earth and the works that are therein shall be burned up; and the atmospheric heaven will pass away with a great noise; and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Then the pious dead, reunited to their bodies, and with them those holy ones that shall be alive at the Lord's coming, both these classes of God's people shall be caught up together to meet the Lord in the air; and shall thus be securely conveyed out of the reach of the general conflagration. Meanwhile, the wicked dead, also reunited to their bodies, and with them, no doubt, those unholy ones who shall then be still alive; both these classes of God's enemies

will be caught and enveloped in the flames which burn up and dissolve a world. As this process goes on, the better particles of more pure matter will be sublimated or volatilized, and thence will mount upward from the centre in all directions; while at the same time, as the lighter particles fly off and ascend, the vast burning mass of gross and solid matter, associating to itself the kindred region of the intermediate Tartarus, will settle spherically to the centre, and produce the substratum of that molten lake of everlasting fire, which is prepared for the devil and his angels, and which with them will be jointly tenanted by the wretched victims of their seduction, the finally lost apostates of the human race.' pp. 412,413.

"To define the precise mode of this gigantic process may justly be deemed an impossibility to us, circumstanced as we are. Apparently, it will bear some resemblance to the following account of it, which exhibits the reversal of the process of fiery destruction. The sublimated particles of dissipated matter descend, by the special will of God indeed, but instrumentally by the mechanical action of gravitation, and as they descend, they combine. A vast spherical arch is formed round the central globe, or flaming nucleus of Gehenna, itself wrapped in a shoreless ocean of liquid fire, the lake of the Apocalypse, burning with brimstone. This arch constitutes the thick massy shell of the renovated earth. Its external surface, beautiful and glorious beyond our present mortal conceptions, becomes the heaven or mansions of the regenerated and redeemed human race, where Christ himself, perfect man as well as perfect God, disdains not to fix his peculiar residence with his brethren according to the flesh, and thus to make their heaven the special local sovereignty of the universal archangel. But, within this unbroken shell, through which there are no spiracles, inasmuch as it is said to have no sea—within this unbroken shell, in fearful vicinity, securely inclosed on every side, so as to prevent all possibility of evasion, is the appointed prison-house of Gehenna." pp. 415, 416, etc.

"We cannot doubt the perfect sincerity of our author, in the reverence with which he professes to refer all to the word of God; but whence could he have derived his rules of interpretation, to elicit such meanings from the word of God, on topics in relation to which its reticence is so remarkable and undoubtedly so wise?"
